



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten signature]

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| 10/711,591 | 09/27/2004 | Michael Burr | 2006579-0272 (CTX-093DV) | 5590 |
| 69665 | 7590 | 09/07/2007 | | EXAMINER |
| CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110 | | | | WATSON, CHARLES A |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2109 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/07/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/711,591 | BURR ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Charles A. Watson | 2109 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Instant application has been filed as a divisional of US Application No. 10/711,583, filed 9/27/04 entitled "System and Method for Managing Virtual IP Addresses" to Burr et al. In accordance with the MPEP, a later application for a distinct or independent invention carved out a pending application and disclosing and claiming only subject matter disclosed in an earlier or parent application known as a divisional application or "division." A divisional application is often filed as a result of a restriction requirement made by the examiner handling the earlier or parent application (see MPEP 201.06).
2. In this case, it is noted that the claims filed on instant application and those filed in the above-mentioned earlier or parent application seem directed to an independent or distinct invention, however, instant divisional application has not been filed as a result of a restriction requirement made by an examiner working on the earlier or parent application.

Abstract

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the applicant's abstract exceeds the total word count allowed of 150. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

4. The use of the trademark Windows Internet Naming Service has been noted in this application, e.g. claim 7. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-5,7-8,10-13,16-17,19-23,25-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata et al, (US 6,041,353), hereinafter referenced as Hirata, in view of Bhalla et. Al. (US 2003/0208602) hereinafter referenced as Bhalla.

Regarding **claim 1**, Hirata teaches a method for providing a user (e.g. 102-1, 102-2) accessing a computer (101-105) on a network (100 or 106) independent from the

computer the user is accessing, (see col. 7, lines 45-67), the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) obtaining (acquiring) a plurality of virtual host names (identifiers) (see Hirata col. 6, line 43-47 and col.8, lines 40-43)
- (b) assigning, from the plurality of virtual host names (identifiers)(see Hirata col.27, lines 24-30), a first virtual host name to a first user accessing a first computer via the network and obtaining a second virtual host name different from the first virtual host name to a second user accessing the first computer via the network, thus, wherein each user's (first, second) virtual host name (identifier) for accessing the first computer via the network is unique, (see Hirata col.8, lines 40-43);
- (c) associating the first virtual host name (identifier) of the first user with first computer and associating the second virtual host name (identifier) of the second user with the first computer, thus associating multiple user identifiers with the first computer (see Hirata col. 2, lines 21-25).

Hirata fails to teach where the identifiers are associated with an Internet Protocol Address.

Bhalla teaches assigning users of computers (12) a host name (network access identifier) in which the identifier associated with an IP address and/or any other associated parameters and identifier the user of the computer (see Bhalla [0033]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made given one would be motivated to combine the teachings of Hirata, and Bhalla because in doing so it would grant user(s) the ability to access a remote

computer by obtaining an identifier which would be assigned to that user and using a DHCP which would associate the IP address to host name, to properly push data to the end user of the computer.

Regarding **claim 2**, obtaining a plurality of Internet protocol addresses from e.g. a (pool of addresses) for assigning unique Internet protocol addresses to each of the first user and the second user (See Bhalla [0033]).

Regarding **claim 3**, obtaining the plurality of Internet protocol addresses from a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) server (50 of Fig. 1) (see Bhalla: 0034).

Regarding **claim 4**, reserving (available for a period amount of time) at least one of the plurality of Internet protocol addresses for at least one of the first user and the second user (see Bhalla 0036).

Regarding **claim 5**, associating at least one reserved Internet protocol address with at least one of the first virtual host name (network identifier), (see Bhalla [0033] and [0036]).

Regarding **claim 7**, registering (e.g. storing), with a “name resolution service” (virtual network identity framework) (database or storage) that supports the storage and access thereto, at least one of the plurality of virtual host names to at least one of the first user and the second user (see Bhalla [0033] and [0036]).

Regarding **claim 8**, wherein the name resolution service comprises a Domain Name (see Bhalla [0038]).

Regarding **claim 10**, assigning the first virtual host name (user identifier) to the first user accessing a second computer, and associating the first virtual host name (user identifier) with an Internet protocol address of the second computer associated with the first user. Specifically, Hirata teaches that the user identifier is the uniquely managed identifier of a user who authorized to use my computer, and even with respect to the identical user, he or she might have different identifiers allocated to different computers, (see Hirata col. 8, line 39-43).

Regarding **claim 11**, assigning the second virtual host name (identifier) to the second user accessing a second computer, and associating the second virtual host name (identifier) with an internet protocol address of the second computer associated with the second user. Specifically, Hirata teaches that the user identifier is the uniquely managed identifier of a user who authorized to use my computer, and even with respect to the identical user, he or she might have different identifiers allocated to different computers, (see Hirata col. 8, line 39-43).

Regarding **claim 12**, assigning, while the first user (user identifier) accesses the first computer, a third virtual host name to the first user accessing a second computer and

associating the third virtual host name (user identifier) with an internet protocol address of the second computer associated with the first user. Specifically, Hirata teaches that the user identifier is the uniquely managed identifier of a user who authorized to use my computer, and even with respect to the identical user, he or she might have different identifiers allocated to different computers, (see Hirata col. 8, line 39-43).

Regarding **claim 13**, assigning, while the second user accesses the first computer, a fourth virtual host name (user identifier) to the second user accessing a second computer, and associating the fourth virtual host name (user identifier) with an internet protocol address of the second computer associated with the second user. Specifically, Hirata teaches that the user identifier is the uniquely managed identifier of a user who authorized to use my computer, and even with respect to the identical user, he or she might have different identifiers allocated to different computers, (see Hirata col. 8, line 39-43).

Regarding **claim 16**, the above-mentioned references further teach:

a server(computer) on a network, the server providing a plurality of virtual host names (identifiers) (see Hirata col. 27, line 24-30 and col.8, lines 40-43);

a first computer on the network obtaining from the plurality of virtual host names, a first virtual host name for a first user of the first computer and a second virtual host

name different from the first virtual host name for a second user of the first computer
(See Hirata col. 6, line 43-47 and col. 8, line 40-43); and

 a network interface_(see Hirata 203 of fig.2) of the first computer associating the
first virtual host name of the first user with an internet protocol address of the first user
associated with the first computer_(see Hirata 203 of fig.2), and

 associating the second virtual host name of the second user with an internet
protocol of the second user associated with the first computer (see Hirata col.8, lines
40-43).

Regarding **claim 17**, wherein the same limitations as claim 2 is evident and, therefor, is
rejected on the same basis as claim 2.

Regarding **claim 19**, wherein the same limitations as claim 3 is evident and, therefor, is
rejected on the same basis as claim 3.

Regarding **claim 20**, wherein the same limitations as claim 4 is evident and, therefor, is
rejected on the same basis as claim 4.

Regarding **claim 21**, wherein the same limitations as claim 5 is evident and, therefor, is
rejected on the same basis as claim 5.

Regarding **claim 22**, wherein the same limitations as claim 7 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 7.

Regarding **claim 23**, wherein the same limitations as claim 8 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 8.

Regarding **claim 25**, wherein the same limitations as claim 10 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 10.

Regarding **claim 26**, wherein the same limitations as claim 11 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 11.

Regarding **claim 27**, wherein the same limitations as claim 12 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 12.

Regarding **claim 28**, wherein the same limitations as claim 13 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 13.

Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata and Bhalla, in view of Hipp (US 7,146,431) hereinafter referenced as Hipp2.

Regarding **claim 6**, the above-mentioned prior art fails to teach assigning from the plurality of IP addresses, a first IP address to the first user and second IP address different from the first IP address to the second user, thus assigning unique IP addresses to each user.

Hipp2 teaches assigning, from the plurality of Internet protocol addresses, a first Internet protocol address to the first user, and a second Internet protocol address, different from the first Internet protocol address, to the second user, thus the assigned IP address are unique (see Hipp2 col. 6, lines 6-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hipp2 in the Hirata system. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine the teachings of Hipp2 because Hipp2 teaches that it is possible for multiple users after obtaining an unique IP address taught by Hirata, the user can then be assigned an IP address which is unique to each user.

Regarding **claim 18**, wherein the same limitations as claim 6 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 6.

Claims 14 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata and Bhalla, in view of Hipp (US Patent 7,210,147) hereinafter referenced as Hipp1.

Regarding **claim 14**, the above-mentioned prior art does not teach wherein the naming at least one virtual host names with a portion of the characters representing the user's identity on the network (e.g. network-wide descriptors such as sockets, port, identifiers of computers on the network or subnet work such as IP addresses) (see Hipp1 col. 6, lines 55 –col. 7, line 5 and Bhalla [0025]).

Hipp1 teaches that an identifier is assigned to represent a specific system resource and acts as a handle when referencing that system resource. (col. 6 line 55) A resource corresponds with the identifier on the computer network. An example of this is an network IP address (col. 6 line 67- col. 7 line 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Hipp1 in the Hirata and Bhalla system. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine the teachings of Hipp1 because Hipp1 teaches that using an identifier along with an IP address; the user can be identified on the network.

Regarding **claim 29**, wherein the same limitations as claim 14 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 14.

Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata and Bhalla as applied to claim 7 and 22, in further view of Mellquist et al. (US 6,115,545), hereinafter referenced as Mellquist.

Regarding **claim 9**, the above-mentioned prior art does not teach wherein the name resolution service, specifically, comprises a Windows Internet Naming Service.

Mellquist teaches wherein the name resolution service comprises a Windows Internet Naming Service (see Mellquist col. 2, line 21-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Mellquist in the Hirata system. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine the teachings of Mellquist because a Windows Internet Naming Service manages the association of workstation names and locations with Internet Protocol addresses (IP addresses) without the user or an administrator having to be involved in each configuration change.

Regarding **claim 24**, wherein the same limitations as claim 9 is evident and, therefor, is rejected on the same basis as claim 9.

Claims 15 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirata and Bhalla as applied to claim 1 and 16, in further view of in view of Day et al. (US 6,728,767), hereinafter referenced as Day.

Regarding **claim 15**, although Hirata teaches identifying the session (time of usage) of the user when the user is concurrently accessing multiple computers on the network

(See Hirata col. 5, line 24-27); the above-mentioned prior art does not teach the using of a portion (suffix) of the username to identify the session of the user.

Day discloses using of a portion (suffix) of the username to identify the session of the user. Specifically, Day teaches naming at least one of the pluralities of virtual host names with a suffix (portion of the virtual host name i.e., prefix) (see Day col. 4, line 40-42),

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Day in the Hirata system. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to combine the teachings of Day because a person skilled in the art could use the suffix as oppose to the prefix which Day teaches and combine it with the teachings of Hirata who uses a central server to identify a user's session by the user's identifier.

Regarding **claim 30**, wherein the same limitations as claim 15 are evident and, therefor, are rejected on the same basis as claim 15.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles A. Watson whose telephone number is (571)270-3633. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs -7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beatriz Prieto can be reached (571) 272-3902 or beatriz.prieto@uspto.gov.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER